

# Exhibit A

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

STEVE TEIXEIRA,

Plaintiff.

v.  
MOZILLA CORPORATION a.k.a. M.F.  
Technologies, a California corporation;  
MOZILLA FOUNDATION, a California public  
benefit corporation; LAURA CHAMBERS and  
her marital community; WINIFRED MITCHELL  
BAKER and her marital community, and DANI  
CHEHAK and her marital community.

## Defendants.

| Case No. 2:24-cv-1032

**DEFENDANT MOZILLA  
CORPORATION'S RESPONSES  
TO PLAINTIFF'S SECOND SET  
OF INTERROGATORIES AND  
REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION**

TO: Plaintiff Steve Teixeira

AND TO: Plaintiff's Counsel of Record

Defendant Mozilla Corporation (“Defendant”), by and through their counsel of record, hereby responds to Plaintiff Steve Teixeira (“Plaintiff”) Second Set of Interrogatories and Requests for Production to Defendant Mozilla Corporation as follows:

## GENERAL OBJECTIONS AND DEFINITIONS

The following General Objections shall be considered as made, to the extent applicable, in response to each of the Interrogatories and Requests, as if the General Objections were fully set forth in each such response, including those responses which also set forth specific objections.

1. Defendant objects to each Interrogatory and Request to the extent that it seeks to impose obligations beyond those set forth by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

1 usage, are relevant, responsive, and non-privileged. To the extent Plaintiff required Defendant to  
 2 do more than the foregoing, Defendant objects to each and every Request on the ground that it  
 3 would subject Defendant to oppression, harassment, and undue burden.

4 **ANSWER TO INTERROGATORIES**

5 **INTERROGATORY NO. 8:** Identify all Mozilla Corporation employees who separated from  
 6 employment with Mozilla Corporation within six months of taking a leave of absence, including  
 7 the circumstances of their separations (voluntary or involuntary), since January 1, 2015.

8 **ANSWER TO INTERROGATORY NO. 8:**

9 Defendant objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds that it seeks documents containing  
 10 information pertaining to individuals, the disclosure of which would constitute a violation of any  
 11 individual's right of privacy under Article I, Section 7 of the Washington Constitution and/or any  
 12 other constitutional, statutory, or common law right of privacy. Defendant also objects to this  
 13 Interrogatory as overly broad, unduly burdensome, and not reasonably tailored or proportional to  
 14 the needs of this case insofar as it seeks information that is not relevant to any party's claims or  
 15 defenses. This Interrogatory asks for information relating to Defendant's employees, regardless of  
 16 their relation to Plaintiff's allegations in the Complaint. Additionally, this Interrogatory is  
 17 overbroad in time and scope. This Interrogatory seeks information spanning nearly a decade (and  
 18 seven years before Plaintiff was hired). Defendant also objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds  
 19 that it seeks information protected by the attorney-client privilege, work-product doctrine, and/or  
 20 other applicable privileges.

21  
 22 **INTERROGATORY NO. 9:** Identify all Mozilla Corporation employees who separated from  
 23 employment with Mozilla Corporation after requesting a disability accommodation, including the  
 24 circumstances of their separations (voluntary or involuntary), since January 1, 2015.

25 **ANSWER TO INTERROGATORY NO. 9:**

1 Defendant objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds that it seeks documents containing  
 2 information pertaining to individuals, the disclosure of which would constitute a violation of any  
 3 individual's right of privacy under Article I, Section 7 of the Washington Constitution and/or any  
 4 other constitutional, statutory, or common law right of privacy. Defendant also objects to this  
 5 Interrogatory as overly broad, unduly burdensome, and not reasonably tailored or proportional to  
 6 the needs of this case insofar as it seeks information that is not relevant to any party's claims or  
 7 defenses. This Interrogatory asks for information relating to Defendant's employees, regardless of  
 8 their relation to Plaintiff's allegations in the Complaint. Additionally, this Interrogatory is  
 9 overbroad in time and scope. This Interrogatory seeks information spanning nearly a decade (and  
 10 seven years before Plaintiff was hired). Defendant also objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds  
 11 that it seeks information protected by the attorney-client privilege, work-product doctrine, and/or  
 12 other applicable privileges.

13

14       **INTERROGATORY NO. 10:** As to the employees identified in Answers to  
 15 Interrogatories Numbers 8 and 9, provide their most recent annual review ratings immediately  
 16 before taking leave and their first annual review ratings immediately after taking leave.

17       **ANSWER TO INTERROGATORY NO. 10:**

18       Defendant objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds that it seeks documents containing  
 19 information pertaining to individuals, the disclosure of which would constitute a violation of any  
 20 individual's right of privacy under Article I, Section 7 of the Washington Constitution and/or any  
 21 other constitutional, statutory, or common law right of privacy. Defendant also objects to this  
 22 Interrogatory as overly broad, unduly burdensome, and not reasonably tailored or proportional to  
 23 the needs of this case insofar as it seeks information that is not relevant to any party's claims or  
 24 defenses. This Interrogatory asks for information relating to Defendant's employees, regardless of  
 25 their relation to Plaintiff's allegations in the Complaint. Additionally, this Interrogatory is  
 26 overbroad in time and scope. This Interrogatory seeks information spanning nearly a decade (and

1 seven years before Plaintiff was hired). Defendant also objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds  
 2 that it seeks information protected by the attorney-client privilege, work-product doctrine, and/or  
 3 other applicable privileges.

4

5 **INTERROGATORY NO. 11:** Identify and describe Mozilla Corporation's policies and practices  
 6 for addressing internal claims of discrimination in place since January 1, 2015, including without  
 7 limitation any written policies or materials.

8 **ANSWER TO INTERROGATORY NO. 11:**

9 Defendant objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds that it is overly broad, unduly  
 10 burdensome, and not reasonably tailored or proportional to the needs of this case insofar as it seeks  
 11 information that is not relevant to any party's claims or defenses. This Interrogatory seeks  
 12 information spanning nearly a decade (and seven years before Plaintiff was hired), which is  
 13 excessive and not reasonably limited in time and scope. Defendant also objects to this Interrogatory  
 14 on the grounds that it seeks information protected by the attorney-client privilege, work-product  
 15 doctrine, and/or other applicable privileges. Without waiving the objections, Defendant responds  
 16 as follows:

17 Defendant refers to its policies, which will be produced in response to Plaintiff's Second  
 18 Set of Requests for Production of Documents.

19

20 **INTERROGATORY NO. 12:** Identify any internal discrimination complaints for which the  
 21 process identified in response to Interrogatory No. 10 was not followed, including how the process  
 22 was not followed and the reason(s) why the process was not followed.

23 **ANSWER TO INTERROGATORY NO. 12:**

24 Defendant objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds that it seeks documents containing  
 25 information pertaining to individuals, the disclosure of which would constitute a violation of any  
 26 individual's right of privacy under Article I, Section 7 of the Washington Constitution and/or any

1 defenses. Additionally, this Interrogatory is overbroad in time and scope. Further, this  
 2 Interrogatory asks for information relating to Defendant's employees, regardless of their relation  
 3 to Plaintiff's allegations in the Complaint. Defendant also objects to this Interrogatory on the  
 4 grounds that it seeks information protected by the attorney-client privilege, work-product doctrine,  
 5 and/or other applicable privileges.

6

7 **RESPONSE TO REQUESTS FOR PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS**

8 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 10:** Produce all recordings of and notes from Steering  
 9 Committee meetings from June 1, 2023 to the present.

10 **RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 10:**

11 Defendant objects to this Request as overly broad, unduly burdensome, and not reasonably  
 12 tailored or proportional to the needs of this case insofar as it seeks information that is not relevant  
 13 to any party's claims or defenses. Additionally, this Request is overbroad in scope. Further, this  
 14 Request asks for information relating to Defendant's employees, regardless of their relation to  
 15 Plaintiff's allegations in the Complaint. Defendant also objects to this Request on the grounds that  
 16 it seeks information protected by the attorney-client privilege, work-product doctrine, and/or other  
 17 applicable privileges. Without waiving the objections, Defendant responds as follows:

18 Defendant will produce non-privileged notes and recording from the steering committee  
 19 meetings from June 1, 2023 to June 1, 2024.

20

21 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 11:** Produce all performance evaluations for 2022-2024  
 22 for Mitchell Baker and all members of the Executive Steering Committee including Laura  
 23 Chambers, Ian Carmichael, Dani Chehak, Eric Muhlheim, Lindsey O'Brien, Girish Rao, Brad  
 24 Smallwood, Carlos Torres, Imo Udom, Kristen Trubey, and Suba Vasudevan.

1 **RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 11:**

2 Defendant objects to this Request on the grounds that it seeks documents containing  
 3 information pertaining to individuals, the disclosure of which would constitute a violation of any  
 4 individual's right of privacy under Article I, Section 7 of the Washington Constitution and/or any  
 5 other constitutional, statutory, or common law right of privacy. Defendant also objects to this  
 6 Request as overly broad, unduly burdensome, and not reasonably tailored or proportional to the  
 7 needs of this case insofar as it seeks information that is not relevant to any party's claims or  
 8 defenses. Additionally, this Request is overbroad in time and scope. Further, this Request asks for  
 9 information relating to Defendant's employees, regardless of their relation to Plaintiff's allegations  
 10 in the Complaint.

11

12 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 12:** Produce all CEO-approved financial and headcount  
 13 budgets in effect from September 1, 2023 until December 31, 2023.

14 **RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 12:**

15 Defendant objects to this Request as overly broad, unduly burdensome, and not reasonably  
 16 tailored or proportional to the needs of this case insofar as it seeks information that is not relevant  
 17 to any party's claims or defenses. In particular, documents that merely mention or relate to the  
 18 financial and headcount budgets are over encompassing and will not necessarily relate to claims  
 19 or defenses. Additionally, this Request is overbroad in scope. Further, Defendant also objects to  
 20 this Request on the grounds that it seeks information protected by the attorney-client privilege,  
 21 work-product doctrine, and/or other applicable privileges. Without waiving the objections,  
 22 Defendant responds as follows:

23 Defendant will agree to produce the final Board-approved financial budget from 2023.

1 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 19:** Produce Documents sufficient to show Mozilla  
 2 Corporation's total revenue and revenue per user calculations each month since January 1, 2019.

3 **RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 19:**

4 Defendant objects to this Request as overly broad, unduly burdensome, and not reasonably  
 5 tailored or proportional to the needs of this case insofar as it seeks information that is not relevant  
 6 to any party's claims or defenses. Subject to and without waiving these objections, Defendant  
 7 responds as follows:

8 Defendant is unable to comply with this request because such a report does not exist.

9  
 10 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 20:** Produce Documents sufficient to show Mozilla  
 11 Corporation's product performance goals from October 1, 2023 to the present, and documents  
 12 sufficient to show reporting regarding the attainment of such goals.

13 **RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 20:**

14 Defendant objects to this Request as overly broad, unduly burdensome, and not reasonably  
 15 tailored or proportional to the needs of this case insofar as it seeks information that is not relevant  
 16 to any party's claims or defenses. Defendant also objects to this Request on the grounds that it  
 17 seeks information protected by the attorney-client privilege, work-product doctrine, and/or other  
 18 applicable privileges. Subject to and without waiving these objections, Defendant responds as  
 19 follows:

20 Defendant will produce the KPIs.

21  
 22 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 21:** Produce all complaints or reports made to Mozilla  
 23 Corporation's Human Resources department regarding mistreatment or discrimination based on  
 24 disability from January 1, 2015 to the present.

1 **RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 21:**

2 Defendant objects to this Request as overly broad, unduly burdensome, and not reasonably  
 3 tailored or proportional to the needs of this case insofar as it seeks information that is not relevant  
 4 to any party's claims or defenses. In particular, complaints that merely mention or relate to  
 5 mistreatment are over encompassing and will not necessarily relate to Plaintiff's claims or  
 6 defenses. Additionally, this Request is overbroad in time and scope. This Request seeks  
 7 information spanning nearly a decade (and seven years before Plaintiff was hired). Further,  
 8 Defendant also objects to this Request on the grounds that it seeks information protected by the  
 9 attorney-client privilege, work-product doctrine, and/or other applicable privileges. Finally,  
 10 Defendant objects to this Request on the grounds that it seeks documents containing information  
 11 pertaining to individuals, the disclosure of which would constitute a violation of any individual's  
 12 right of privacy under Article I, Section 7 of the Washington Constitution and/or any other  
 13 constitutional, statutory, or common law right of privacy.

14

15 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 22:** Produce all documents referring or relating to the  
 16 termination of Plaintiff's employment.

17 **RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 22:**

18 Defendant objects to this Request on the grounds that it seeks information protected by the  
 19 attorney-client privilege, work-product doctrine, and/or other applicable privileges. Plaintiff was  
 20 terminated after Plaintiff filed the instant lawsuit. All discussions and documents relating to his  
 21 termination are privileged.

22

23 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 23:** Produce all documents identified in response to  
 24 Interrogatory No. 16.

1 also objects to this Request on the grounds that it seeks documents containing information  
 2 pertaining to individuals, the disclosure of which would constitute a violation of any individual's  
 3 right of privacy under Article I, Section 7 of the Washington Constitution and/or any other  
 4 constitutional, statutory, or common law right of privacy. Without waiving the objections,  
 5 Defendant responds as follows:

6 Defendant will produce all non-privileged documents responsive to this Request.

7

8 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 26:** Produce all reports, summaries, follow-ups, tracking  
 9 documents, or excerpts related to the report and assessment of Mozilla Corporation by TK Law.

10 **RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 26:**

11 Defendant objects to this Request on the grounds that it seeks information protected by the  
 12 attorney-client privilege, work-product doctrine, and/or other applicable privileges. Defendant  
 13 also objects to this Request as overly broad, unduly burdensome, and not reasonably tailored or  
 14 proportional to the needs of this case insofar as it seeks information that is not relevant to any  
 15 party's claims or defenses. In particular, communications that merely mention or relate to the TK  
 16 Law report or assessment are over encompassing and will not necessarily relate to claims or  
 17 defenses.

18

19 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 27:** Produce all Correspondence regarding the TK Law  
 20 investigation, report, recommendations, assessment, and implementation of same.

21 **RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 27:**

22 Defendant objects to this Request on the grounds that it seeks information protected by the  
 23 attorney-client privilege, work-product doctrine, and/or other applicable privileges. Defendant  
 24 also objects to this Request as overly broad, unduly burdensome, and not reasonably tailored or  
 25 proportional to the needs of this case insofar as it seeks information that is not relevant to any  
 26 party's claims or defenses. In particular, communications that merely mention or relate to the TK

1 Law report or assessment are over encompassing and will not necessarily relate to claims or  
2 defenses.

3

4 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 28:** Produce all Documents and Correspondence  
5 regarding Plaintiff's application for unemployment insurance compensation.

6 **RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 28:**

7 Defendant objects to this Request as overly broad, unduly burdensome, and not reasonably  
8 tailored or proportional to the needs of this case insofar as it seeks information that is not relevant  
9 to any party's claims or defenses. Defendant objects to this Request on the grounds that it seeks  
10 information protected by the attorney-client privilege, work-product doctrine, and/or other  
11 applicable privileges. Without waiving the objections, Defendant responds as follows:

12 Defendant is unable to comply with this request because Mozilla never received an  
13 unemployment claim from Plaintiff.

14

15 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 29:** Produce all Documents and Correspondence  
16 describing any decisions to restructure leadership at Mozilla Corporation between January 1, 2022  
17 and the present.

18 **RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 29:**

19 Defendant objects to this Request on the grounds that it seeks information protected by the  
20 attorney-client privilege, work-product doctrine, and/or other applicable privileges. Defendant  
21 objects to this Request as overly broad, unduly burdensome, and not reasonably tailored or  
22 proportional to the needs of this case insofar as it seeks information that is not relevant to any  
23 party's claims or defenses. In particular, "all documents" that merely mention or relate to  
24 restructuring leadership between January 2022 and the present are over encompassing and will not  
25 necessarily relate to claims or defenses.

1 **VERIFICATION**

2 I, Laura Chambers, the Chief Executive Officer of Mozilla Corporation a.k.a M.F.  
3 Technologies, declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of Washington that I  
4 have read the foregoing answers and responses to Plaintiff's Second Set of Interrogatories and all  
5 of the answers and responses are true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief.

4/2/2025 | 13:11 PDT

6 DECLARED this \_\_\_\_\_ day of April 2025.

Signed by:

*Laura Chambers*

BF20951752E2449

7 Mozilla Corporation a.k.a M.F. Technologies

8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

1 Dated this 2nd day of April, 2025.  
2

3 DLA PIPER LLP (US)  
4

5 By: s/ Anthony Todaro  
6

7 Anthony Todaro, WSBA No. 30391  
8

9 By: s/ Alexandria Cates  
10

11 Alexandria Cates, WSBA No. 53786  
12

13 701 Fifth Avenue, Suite 6900  
14

15 Seattle, Washington 98104-7029  
16

17 Tel: 206.839.4800  
18

19 E-mail: [anthony.todaro@us.dlapiper.com](mailto:anthony.todaro@us.dlapiper.com)  
20

21 E-mail: [alexandria.cates@us.dlapiper.com](mailto:alexandria.cates@us.dlapiper.com)  
22

23 *Attorneys for Defendants MOZILLA  
24 CORPORATION a.k.a M.F.  
25 TECHNOLOGIES, LAURA CHAMBERS,  
26 WINIFRED MITCHELL BAKER, and  
DANI CHEHAK*

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on April 2, 2025, I caused a true and correct copy of the foregoing document to be served on the parties listed below in the manner indicated:

Amy Alexander Mathew Harrington STOKES LAWRENCE, P.S. 1420 Fifth Avenue, Suite 3000 Seattle, WA 98101-2393 Telephone: (206) 626-6000 Fax: (206) 464-1496 <a href="mailto:Amy.alexander@stokeslaw.com">Amy.alexander@stokeslaw.com</a> <a href="mailto:Mathew.Harrington@stokeslaw.com">Mathew.Harrington@stokeslaw.com</a> <a href="mailto:laura.smith@stokeslaw.com">laura.smith@stokeslaw.com</a> <a href="mailto:sarah.armon@stokeslaw.com">sarah.armon@stokeslaw.com</a> <a href="mailto:Maricarmen.Perez-Vargas@stokeslaw.com">Maricarmen.Perez-Vargas@stokeslaw.com</a> <a href="mailto:anna.armitage@stokeslaw.com">anna.armitage@stokeslaw.com</a>	<input type="checkbox"/> Via Hand Delivery <input type="checkbox"/> Via U.S. Mail <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Via E-mail <input type="checkbox"/> Via the Court's E-Service Device
<i>Attorneys for Plaintiff Steve Teixeira</i>	
Darren A. Feider Amanda V. Masters SEBRIS BUSTO JAMES 15375 SE 30th Pl., STE 310 Bellevue, Washington 98007 <a href="mailto:dfeider@sbj.law">dfeider@sbj.law</a> <a href="mailto:amasters@sbj.law">amasters@sbj.law</a> <a href="mailto:epruzinsky@sbj.law">epruzinsky@sbj.law</a> <a href="mailto:kmarchenko@sbj.law">kmarchenko@sbj.law</a>	<input type="checkbox"/> Via Hand Delivery <input type="checkbox"/> Via U.S. Mail <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Via E-mail <input type="checkbox"/> Via the Court's E-Service Device
<i>Attorneys for Defendant Mozilla Foundation</i>	

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the state of Washington that the foregoing is true and correct.

Dated this 2<sup>nd</sup> day of April, 2025.

s/Jacey Bittle  
 Jacey Bittle, Legal Executive Assistant